UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,539	02/26/2002	Wenda Carlyle	PA872	9853
	7590 01/14/200 VASCULAR, INC.	EXAMINER		
IP LEGAL DEI	PARTMENT	FISHER, ABIGAIL L		
3576 UNOCAL SANTA ROSA	=		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/14/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rs.vasciplegal@medtronic.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/085,539	CARLYLE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ABIGAIL FISHER	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS		-	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>see explanation below</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	* **	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,5-7,9,11 and 27</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	hafara ar an tha data of filing a Na	ation of Annaal will not	he entered
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Mina Haghighatian/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1616	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that the prior art cited by the examiner, namely Berg et al and Su, are non-analogous art. Berg et al is directed to the instantly claimed invention in so much as it is directed to a method for making an intravascular stent by applying to the body of a stent a solution which includes a solvent, a polymer dissolved in the solvent and a therapeutic substance dispersed in the solvent. The only difference between the instantly claimed invention and that taught in Berg et al. is that the instant invention claims a specific drug, which is rosiglitazone. Berg et al. clearly teaches that the therapeutic substance that can be applied to the stent includes anti-inflammatories. The examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to look to the pharmaceutical literature for specific anti-inflammatory drugs. Su clearly teaches that rosiglitazone is a known anti-inflammatory drug. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a specific anti-inflammatory in the invention of Berg et al. as Berg et al. specifically teach that this is one type of drug that can be utilized with the stent. The teachings of Su are solely utilized to show that rosiglitazone is a known anti-inflammatory agent in the art. The only difference between the instant invention and Berg et al. is the selection of a specific drug and the selection of a specific drug is considered prima facie obvious depending on the desired condition/symptoms to be treated. Since it is deemed that selection of a specific drug is considered prima facie obvious, Berg and Su are analogous art because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look elsewhere in the pharmaceutical literature for the names of other known anti-inflammatory agents.